## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES	OF AMERICA,	)	
	Government,	)	Case No. 16-CR-21 Milwaukee, Wisconsin
vs.		)	
SAMY MOHAMMED	HAMZEH,	)	January 24, 2018
	Defendant.	)	

## TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAMELA PEPPER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Official Transcriber: Richard Derrick Ehrlich, RMR, CRR richard\_ehrlich@wied.uscourts.gov (414) 290-2642

Proceedings recorded by electronic recording. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	For the Government: Gregory J. Haanstad Paul L. Kanter
4	United States Department of Justice Office of the U.S. Attorney
5	517 E. Wisconsin Street Milwaukee, WI 53202
6	414.297.1700 greg.haanstad@usdoj.gov
7	paul.kanter@usdoj.gov
8	
9	For the Defendant: Craig W. Albee Federal Defender Services of
10 11	Wisconsin, Inc. 517 E. Wisconsin Street Room 182
12	Milwaukee, WI 53202 414.221.9900
13	craig_albee@fd.org
14	Joseph A. Bugni Appearing Telephonically
15	Federal Defender Services of Wisconsin, Inc.
16	22 E. Mifflin Street Suite 1000
17	Madison, WI 53703 608.260.9900
18	joseph_bugni@fd.org
19	
20	Samy Mohammed Hamzeh, defendant, present in person.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Transcribed From Audio Recording

\* \*

THE CLERK: The Court calls the Criminal Case 2016-CR-21. United States of America vs. Samy Hamzeh.

Please state your appearances starting with the attorneys for the Government.

MR. HAANSTAD: Good morning, Your Honor. Gregory
Haanstad and Paul Kanter of the United States.

Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. ALBEE: Good morning, Your Honor. Mr. Hamzeh appears in person with Craig Albee, and Joe Bugni is on the phone.

THE COURT: Good morning. I assumed Mr. Bugni was there.

Good morning, Mr. Bugni.

MR. BUGNI: Good morning.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you all for getting together today. As you know, this originally had been scheduled for our final pretrial conference date, but then the defense asked -- and I think the Government didn't oppose -- that we convert it to a status conference and take the trial date off because, as it turned out, doing the comparisons of the Arabic and English translations of the

conversations was becoming a little more burdensome and complicated than the defense had anticipated. So we did take the trial date off. We converted today's hearing to a status conference. I know that the two motions that are pending right now -- there's a motion on the Brady materials and a motion to dismiss Count 2. Both of those are pending before Judge Duffin, although it looks like some of the Brady issues may have ended up getting results worked through in the motion process, but still yet he has a ruling scheduled for that.

We had also sent out a pretrial order giving you all dates for turning over your witness list and exhibit lists and things like that. Obviously, that'll get pushed to whenever we select a new trial date. We'll just bump the deadlines to accommodate that trial date.

So as far as I'm aware, the real issue that we need to talk about is a realistic or practical new date for the trial given what still needs to be done. And maybe sort of going backwards and out of order, I should turn to Mr. Albee first to ask what sense you're getting, Mr. Albee, about how much time you'll need on the transcripts?

MR. ALBEE: Judge, we've spent a considerable amount of time going through the transcripts and trying to identify problems, and I've sent some correspondence for the Government identifying our concerns, and Mr. Bugni and

Mr. Kanter and Mr. Haanstad and I all had probably a 45 minute to an hour conversation yesterday evening about transcript issues, and there are a number of -- I think we should be heading in the right direction. We can end up with a lot of disputes about what we hope to accomplish, but the Government will be making some corrections to some of its transcripts and clarifications. We'll be having our translators also examine completed transcripts, and that's just an ongoing process.

I expect that the Government will be turning over some reports that I understand are in the process of being declassified, but that also is a somewhat lengthy process.

That might be another six to eight weeks.

There's still some uncertainty here, although the parties are working together to try to get all these things resolved without the input of the Court.

And then the additional concern, of course, since I wasn't able to talk to Mr. Hamzeh until this morning about my conversation with the Government and where we're at -- obviously, he has a concern about this being, you know, tried sooner rather than later because he's in custody. He asked understandable questions about why this is taking so long, and I share his frustration but also know that we need to have these issues resolved to have the trial.

What we had talked about with the Government

yesterday was setting a status conference in March with the hopes that, you know, the idea would be we're on top of everything, and, you know, there might be a few loose ends, but most of those we're on top of. It's possible, however, we recognize that there might be something that isn't quite as far along as we expect we will be. I mean, all the parties are certainly working as diligently as possible to move this forward.

So I think our request would be twofold: I don't know where the Court's calendar is, but we would like to get something on the date as a likely trial date. We could also set this for a status in March at which time we could be prepared to let the Court know what loose ends need to be addressed, if any, and we would be in a better position to say, "Yes, that trial date definitely works," and to set it that time.

I think the other kind of dates, like identification of expert witnesses, all those other kinds of things -- right now it will be difficult to say, "By April 3<sup>rd</sup>, all transcripts are" -- whatever it is, just to pull something out of the air, it would be difficult right now to do that part of it. But we would -- Mr. Hamzeh particularly would like to have at least a tentative date on the calendar. I know it's difficult with the Court's calendar to have two weeks, but if we wait until March to do

that, then we're farther down the line.

THE COURT: Thank you for that estimation, Mr. Albee.

And before I turn to the Government, let me just ask: Have you given any thought to -- setting aside how my calendar looks, have you given any thought to a date that you think would be far enough off for trial that you could get clear of some of the issues you all are working through?

MR. ALBEE: I would hope something like late May, early June.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

Mr. Haanstad or Mr. Kanter?

MR. HAANSTAD: Mr. Albee is correct. Those are the conversations that we had. And what we discussed yesterday, again, was setting this matter for a scheduling conference, a status conference sometime around the week of March 19<sup>th</sup>. I think that would give us time to work through some issues.

You know, this whole process of having defense translators in some cases start a complete new translation of the same conversations that the Government has had translated, in other situations at least have defense translators go through and review and double-check the Government's translations, it has proven to be a really long, cumbersome process. And it appears we still have a

long ways to go as far as -- I'm trying to at least potentially attempt to reconcile those two (indiscernible) translations. And I think that that process could end up anywhere from the parties jointly presenting the Court and presenting jury stipulated transcripts. We're in agreement that these are the correct translations, conversations that took place among the defendant and the confidential sources. That would be one end of it, an extreme that's possible. At the other end of that spectrum would be we can't come to an agreement, and each party has to submit its own transcripts. I just think we're a long ways away from knowing where between those two items we're going to end up.

So I think that if we're given until somewhere around a week of March, I think we'll be in a much better position to know where we stand on that issue, which is going to play significantly into how much time we need to prepare for trial and how long the trial is going to be.

But I agree. We discussed and agree that it makes sense to set a sort of a hearing sometime the week of March 19<sup>th</sup>, if that works for the Court's calendar, with the idea that -- at least tentatively we would be prepared for trial sometime around the beginning of June.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Haanstad, I know it's hard to imagine sort of a more complicated scenario, which is the one where each party has to present its own transcripts to

the jury or its own translation to the jury, but I think you all had originally projected a two-week trial, it will take two weeks to try the case. Is that still a reasonable projection in your mind if scenario number -- if at the end of the spectrum ends up being --

MR. HAANSTAD: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Would you agree, Mr. Albee?

MR. ALBEE: I think so.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, first of all, in terms of the week of the 19<sup>th</sup> of June for a status -- June? March for a status conference, I'm currently scheduled to be in trial that week in a civil trial, although I scheduled a phone call with those folks to try to figure out if they've even talked to each other because this seems like a case that ought to resolve itself. But that being said, at the moment, I would be perfectly happy to give you all a hearing during that date, but it'll have to be one of those 8:30 in the morning or 12:30 lunch things, and I apologize.

So that being said, I could do Tuesday the 20<sup>th</sup> or Wednesday the 21<sup>st</sup>. Either one of those at either 8:30 or 12:30 depending on what works for you all.

MR. ALBEE: That's fine.

MR. HAANSTAD: Any of those will be fine.

THE COURT: Okay. So no preferences as to which?

MR. ALBEE: No. Those days are open.

THE COURT: Okay. Why don't we, if it's all right with you all, then, why don't we do the 21<sup>st</sup> at 12:30. So that's March 21 at 12:30 p.m. for a status conference to find out how things are progressing in terms of the transcripts.

And then in terms of getting a trial date on the calendar, I certainly completely understand Mr. Hamzeh's concerns about the amount of time that this is taking.

I will note just for your benefit, Mr. Hamzeh, or for whatever it's worth, at the end of last year, I had a trial in a similar situation who really wanted the trial to go quickly because he had been in custody, and I think he pushed his attorney to go a little more quickly than his attorney was ready to go. His attorney would've liked to have investigated some more information that he didn't have a chance to investigate, and it became a problem for him when the case went to trial.

So I understand your frustration, and I would probably be in the same boat. But at the same time, I'm having everybody have the equipment that they need to be able to do the best job they can I think is pretty critical.

So you all talked about the end of May, early

June. I would rather not start the end of May because we
got Memorial Day there. So we wouldn't be able to get a

full weekend at the end of May.

I currently have, believe it or not, a mesothelioma asbestosis case starting on the 4<sup>th</sup> of June, and that's scheduled to be a two-week trial. So the first available date that I would have in June is the 18<sup>th</sup>. That week is pretty clear. I don't have anything else. That's a full week.

And the next week, the week of the 25<sup>th</sup>, is also clear other than a couple of hearings, which we can move.

MR. HAANSTAD: And, Judge, can I ask, is that civil trial a (indiscernible)?

THE COURT: Which one? The one --

MR. ALBEE: The one on the  $4^{\mbox{th}}$ . I realize it's always guesswork.

THE COURT: You know, we can push it if we have to. I will tell you, this case was filed in 2010, and it was sent off to multi district litigation, and a whole bunch of stuff got resolved, and then it came back.

The gentleman who had mesothelioma died. This is both a wrongful death and a personal injury suit. His wife is now in her 70s. So we've been trying to get it to move as quickly as possible because she's getting older, and she's not in great health.

Of course, it might resolve itself, but as of right now, it has not.

MR. ALBEE: And my concern is I'm supposed to be out of town roughly the  $21^{\rm st}$  through the  $25^{\rm th}$  or  $26^{\rm th}$ .

MR. HAANSTAD: And I don't know if you're still considering that week of June 4<sup>th</sup>, but I'm scheduled to be out of town on the week of -- the end of that week and the beginning of the week of the 11<sup>th</sup>.

THE COURT: Okay. So it doesn't look like that would work either.

MR. KANTER: Judge, if I could just add. I would be fine the weeks of the 18<sup>th</sup> and the 25<sup>th</sup>, but I have to be done by July 6<sup>th</sup>. So if this runs long, that's my only problem because I'm leaving for Canada for a two-week vacation on July 6<sup>th</sup>. As long as we're done by then, I'm good.

MR. HAANSTAD: I think this points out part of the issue. That week of March 19<sup>th</sup>, we'll be in a much better position to know how long the trial is going to take, whether it's a realistic possibility that it might run into that third week, again, at one end of the spectrum or on the other if maybe we come to some agreements and get this in in a week or a week and a day. We'll be in a better position I think in March to know that, which is why we had in mind sort of a more tentative trial date.

THE COURT: It's frankly six of one, half a dozen of the other to me whether we go ahead and get something on

the calendar now or not. But, you know, if we're now trying 1 to get past -- I mean, Mr. Kanter just indicated that he's 2 3 going to be gone until -- it sounds like your first day back is the 23<sup>rd</sup> of July, right, Mr. Kanter? 4 5 MR. KANTER: That would be correct. I would appreciate not having to come back on the 22<sup>nd</sup> and start 6 trial on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. 7 8 THE COURT: Yeah, I'm sure you would because I've 9 got back-to-back trials for -- yeah, you can't have the 23<sup>rd</sup> anyway because I've got a trial. 10 11 MR. KANTER: (Indiscernible.) THE COURT: By that time, there may be a fourth 12 13 judge here, and maybe my calendar will look a little 14 different. Who knows. One can only hope. I have, it looks like, the week of August 14<sup>th</sup> 15 and the week of August 20<sup>th</sup>. That two-week period in time 16 17 I don't have anything. Also, as of right now, nothing the week of the 27<sup>th</sup> of August. So the first week of August, 18 19 the first full week of August I am to be in trial; but after 20 that, the rest of the month is clear for me. MR. KANTER: The week of the 13<sup>th</sup>, the 20<sup>th</sup>, 21 and 27<sup>th</sup>? 22 23 THE COURT: Yes. 24 MR. HAANSTAD: That's fine by me. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Albee, I know that's -- I'm sorry,

Mr. Kanter.

THE COURT: I know that's later than what you were looking for, Mr. Albee.

MR. KANTER: I was going to say that's fine by me.

MR. KANTER: It could be done before Labor Day, I think.

THE COURT: You know, between now and when we get together again in March, if I have further information about the trial that's supposed to go during the 4<sup>th</sup> -- although it sounds like that's not going to work for Mr. Hamzeh. But, you know, if anything shifts in any of these civil cases that I've got scheduled, or any of the criminal cases go away, I'm more than happy to keep you all up to date on that and let me know if something opens up.

But at the moment, I've got time in June, but it sounds like it doesn't work for everybody. We have that first week of July, but that's not a full week, I don't think, because I think one day that -- we'll be off for the Fourth of July, and then the last day Mr. Kanter will be able will be the 6<sup>th</sup>. We get back to the 23<sup>rd</sup>, and I'm in trial. And then the 30<sup>th</sup>, I'm in trial, and the 6<sup>th</sup> of August. So we've got three weeks at the end of August. We've got the time in June if anybody's travel schedules change.

MR. ALBEE: I just don't think I can push

Case 2:16-cr-00021-PP Filed 07/18/18 Page 14 of 17 Document 142

Mr. Hamzeh that far off.

THE COURT: Well --

 $$\operatorname{MR}.\ ALBEE:\ I\ mean,\ we\ can\ set\ it\ the\ week\ of\ June\ 18^{\mbox{th}}.$ 

THE COURT: Okay. We'll tentatively set it for the week of June 18<sup>th</sup>. In the meantime, I'll see if there's anything that can move on my calendar that if it wasn't already there -- I mean, it is already there. But for now, so that we get something on the calendar, we'll put trial the week of June 18<sup>th</sup>.

I think, it seems to me, given Mr. Hamzeh's comments and everyone else's, that it makes sense to wait until the March status date to talk about due dates for pretrial items. If it looks like you are going to get to a point where it won't need a full two weeks to try the case, that might free up people's calendars and open up a little bit more movement. So I think there are a lot of options here that could open up between now and March.

So I'm going to put the  $18^{\mbox{th}}$  on the calendar so that we have something there.

But, Mr. Albee, I'll make every effort to see if I can't find some space in there that doesn't conflict with your plans but also doesn't put us out to August. We'll see what we can figure out.

Anything else from the Government today?

MR. HAANSTAD: Your Honor, I wasn't sure if whether the Court had made a speedy trial finding with respect to the last continuance; and if so, if that remains in effect? THE COURT: I don't recall, actually, off the top of my head. I apologize. Well, I'll go back and look. If I didn't, I will make that finding, and I'll start, exclude the time now until March the 21<sup>st</sup>, which is our next status conference. MR. HAANSTAD: Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Albee, anything else on behalf of Mr. Hamzeh? MR. ALBEE: No, Judge. THE COURT: All right. Thank you, everyone. keep you up to date. (Hearing concluded.) 

CERTIFICATE I, Richard D. Ehrlich, a Registered Merit Reporter and Certified Realtime Reporter, certify that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription of the audio file provided in the aforementioned matter to the best of my skill and ability. s/Richard D. Ehrlich July 18, 2018 Richard D. Ehrlich, Official Court Reporter